DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 765 CS 012 122

TITLE	Reading Assessment Alternatives.
INSTITUTION	Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, OR. Test Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	TAC-B-442
PUB DATE	Nov 92
NOTE	30p.
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Annotated Bibliographies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Library Collections; *Reading Tests; *Testing
IDENTIFIERS	*Alternative Assessment; Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

ABSTRACT

This annotated bibliography presents the holdings (as of November 1992) of the Test Center lending library of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Many of the 76 entries are informal assessments and are intended mainly for the classroom. The journal articles, books, and chapters of books in the annotated bibliography were published between 1982 and 1992. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TAC-B-442

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

THE TEST CENTER
101 SW Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 275-9500
(800) 547-6339 (Outside Oregon)

ED 381 765

READING ASSESSMENT ALTERNATIVES

NOVEMBER 1992

The following articles represent the current holdings of the Test Center lending library. Presence on the list does not necessarily imply endorsement; rather, articles are listed solely to provide ideas to those pursuing these topics. Many of the entries are informal assessments, and are intended mainly for the classroom. For more information contact Judy Arter, Senior Research Associate, or Matthew Whitaker, Test Center Clerk, at 503-275-9582, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 101 S.W. Main, Suite 500, Portland, Oregon 97204.

Bailey, Janis, et al. ***Problem Solving Our Way to Alternative Evaluation Procedures.*** **Located in: Language Arts, 65, April 1988, pp. 364-373.**

This article describes several teacher-developed skills checklists in reading and writing.

(TC#400.3PROSOO)

Barrs, Myra, Sue Ellis, Hilary Hester, and Anne Thomas. ***The Primary Language Record Handbook for Teachers*****, 1988. Available from: Centre for Language in Primary Education, Webber Row, London SE1 8QW. Also available from: Heinemann Educational Books Inc., 361 Hanover St., Portsmouth, NH 03801, 603-431-7894.**

The Primary Language Record (PLR) has the following features:

1. It collects performance samples from students at several points in time. Both information to collect and the time frame are specified.
2. It promotes integration of literacy and language across the curriculum.
3. It involves parents and students in discussions of the student as a language user.
4. It is an informal assessment designed for use in the classroom.

Part A of the PLR should be completed at the beginning of the school year and sections for student demographics and notes concerning discussions with parents and students. The manual provides suggestions for discussion topics.

Part B of the PLR is completed during the second semester of the school year. It has sections for making open-ended notes about the student's talking/listening, reading and writing. There is a supplemental "Observations and Samples" sheet that the teacher can

CS 013 122

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

use throughout the school year to record information that might be useful for completing Part B. This is essentially a teacher-generated portfolio for each student that contains observations of speaking, listening, reading and writing; and samples of student reading and writing. There are suggestions for how to organize and store this information as well as what to record and how to use the information in instruction.

Part C is completed at the end of the school year and has space for comments by the student's parents, notes on a student conference, and information for next year's teacher.

(TC#070.3PRILAR)

Baskwell, Jane, and Paulette Whitman. *Evaluation: Whole Language, Whole Child*, 1988. Available from: Scholastic, Inc., 730 Broadway, New York, NY 10003.

The authors discuss many recordkeeping and assessment techniques in this monograph: anecdotal records, file folders, monthly writing samples, scrapbooks, gummed notes, spiral notebooks, audio tapes, videotapes, conference binders, formal tests, checklists, etc.

However, although the authors discuss what these things are and how they can be used, they don't discuss content very extensively and only occasionally discuss what characteristics to look for in the student work or responses collected. For example, the authors discuss keeping work in folders, but do not mention the specifics of what to put in the folder or what features to look for in the work to judge progress and instructional needs. Or, they discuss literacy checklists but not what should go on the checklist. Or, they mention having a student draw a picture during registration for school but not what to look for in the way he or she goes about the task. Or, they discuss writing samples but not how to know when progress in writing is occurring.

In a few cases more information is given. For example, the authors provide a miscue recording checklist (although the terms are not defined), and references to specific assessment devices published by others.

(TC#400.3EVAWLWC)

Bean, Thomas. *Organizing and Retaining Information by Thinking Like an Author.* Located in: Susan Glazer, Lyndon Searfoss, and Lance Gentile (Eds.), Reexamining Reading Diagnosis, New Trends and Procedures, 1988, pp. 103-127. Available from: International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Rd., P.O. Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714, 302-731-1600.

The author presents recent thinking about the role of text structure in reading comprehension, and describes a process for observing, assessing, and improving students' understanding of text structure.

The author first describes various types of text structures in narrative and expository writing, and reviews the research on how people use text structure to aid comprehension and recall.

The assessment procedure consists of having students place the paragraphs in a narrative or expository passage in the right order, thinking aloud as they do so. The author presents several examples which illustrate what to look for in the "think alouds" in order to determine knowledge and use of text structure.

The author finishes by describing two techniques to teach students how to analyze and use text structure.

(TC#440.6ORGREI)

Brown, Carol and Susan Lytle. *Merging Assessment and Instruction: Protocols in the Classroom.* Located in: Susan Glazer, Lyndon Searfoss, and Lance Gentile (Eds.), Reexamining Reading Diagnosis, New Trends and Procedures, 1988, pp. 94-102. Available from: International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Rd., P.O. Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714, 302-731-1600.

The authors maintain that "think aloud reading protocols" provide a means for gathering information about individual readers' ongoing thinking processes and metacognitive behavior. A think aloud reading protocol is a verbal or written record of what students think about while they read.

The authors suggest several means to use during regular instruction to elicit these types of verbalizations. (In fact, making these verbalizations conscious is a major focus of instruction for the authors.) They also describe a coding scheme for these verbalizations.

The paper does not, however, provide any guidance on either what kinds (or mix) of verbalizations students *should* be making, or what to do if the teacher notices gaps in verbalization. The goal seems to be merely to get students to verbalize, think about these verbalizations, and compare these verbalizations with others.

(TC#440.6MERASI)

Calfee, Robert, and Elfrieda Hiebert. *The Teacher's Role in Using Assessment to Improve Learning.* Located in: Assessment in the Service of Learning, Invitational Conference Proceedings, 1988, pp. 45-61. Available from: Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ 08541, 609-734-5686.

The authors believe that the knowledgeable teacher plays a critical role in valid classroom assessment, and that effective instruction requires informed professional judgment. Although a general argument, their specific examples come from the area of literacy. They contend that literacy needs in previous times were far more simple than what will be required in the future. Thus, while the past skills-based, decoding approach might have been adequate for a previous age, in today's world literacy means people who are in total control of language and are able to think critically about what they read. Reading skill must provide the basis for pursuing all other subjects.

The authors develop this theme in more detail, contrasting past teacher education, reading instruction, and student assessment procedures to what is needed today.

(TC#440.6TEAROU)

Campbell, Donna. *Arizona Student Assessment Plan*, 1990. Available from: Arizona Department of Education, 1535 W. Jefferson St., Phoenix, AZ 85007, 602-542-5393.

The Arizona Assessment Program has several parts: a short standardized achievement test, non-test indicators, and performance assessments in reading, math and writing. The performance tests are designed to measure the state's Essential Skills. The reading portion uses a single extended passage for each test. The students begin with a prereading activity such as thinking about the historical context of a selection. Then they

read the selection and answer a series of questions: multiple-choice, short-answer, and writing paragraphs analyzing the work.

Each extended exercise has its own specific of scoring criteria that involves assigning point values depending on whether various features are present in the response.

(TC#060.3ARISTA)

Carver, Ronald P. *Rauding Efficiency Level Test*, 1987. Available from: Revrac Publications, Inc., 207 W. 116th St., Kansas City, MO 64114.

The Rauding Efficiency Level Test (RELT) is an individually administered reading test that determines the most difficult material that an individual can comprehend while reading at a rate that is appropriate for the difficulty level of the materials. Comprehension is defined as understanding at least 75 percent of the sentences in the passage.

(TC#440.3RAUEFL)

Clark, Charles H. *Assessing Free Recall (Analytical Reading Inventory).* Located in: The Reading Teacher, 35, January 1982, pp. 434-439.

This document describes a procedure for assessing how much of a passage a student remembers and the relative importance of what is remembered. The teacher breaks a passage into pausal units and assigns an importance number to each unit. After the student reads the passage silently, he or she retells everything he or she remembers. The teacher indicates the sequence of recall on a worksheet and analyzes the amount recalled, the sequence of recall, and the level of importance of the recalled material.

(TC#440.3ASSFRR)

Clay, Marie. *Concepts About Print.* Located in: The Early Detection of Reading Difficulties, 1985. Available from: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc., 361 Hanover St., Portsmouth, NH 03801, 603-431-7894.

Concepts About Print is a diagnostic procedure that the author presents as part of a longer book about reading in the early grades. The procedure requires the student to respond to 24 questions and tasks surrounding books, such as: "Show me the front of this book," and "Point to it while I read it." Questions and tasks cover parts of the book, how a story is organized, how words are arranged on a page, word/print correspondence, which page is read first, meaning of punctuation, capital and lower case correspondence, etc. The procedure refers to two standard stories which are not included in the entry.

The author states that this procedure is a "sensitive indicator of one group of behaviors which support reading acquisition." There are translations in English, Danish, and Spanish.

The author also presents another list of behaviors to observe while going through *Concepts About Print* to look at effectiveness of strategies.

There is no technical information available in the source cited.

(TC#440.3CONABP)

Costella, Lorraine. ***(Fredrick County Alternative Assessment Project) Essential Curriculum: Learning and Assessment in Frederick County Public Schools; An Overview of Assessment that Promotes Learning*****, 1991. Available from: Frederick County Public School System, 115 E. Church St., Frederick, MD 21701, 301-694-1052.**

This entry is a handbook developed by the district to provide guidance on a statewide change from norm-referenced achievement testing to performance-based assessments. The document includes an extensive reading assessment exercise with a scoring guide, and a student response for one part of the assessment--critical analysis of the selection. Classroom teachers have been involved in designing this and other such assessments.

(TC#150.6FRECOA)

CTB/McGraw-Hill. ***California Achievement Test, 5 -- Performance Assessment Supplement,*** **1992. Available from: CTB MacMillan/McGraw Hill, P.O. Box 150, Monterey, CA 93942, 800-538-9547.**

This document is the pilot edition of a performance assessment supplement being developed for the CAT-5. There are 12-25 performance tasks in each of reading, writing, math, science, and social studies, at each of four levels (grades K-3, 4/5, 6/7, and 8/9). Most of the tasks are open-response (only one right answer) except for writing (which are essay tasks). Examples of open-response items are: completing a sentence, circling one or more correct answers, marking things on a map or graph, and short responses to published stories (expository or narrative).

The whole thing will take two to three hours to give depending on level and can be either locally scored or scored by the publisher. The writing assessment will have scaled prompts and norms.

(TC#060.3CAT5PA)

Degrees of Reading Power**, 1986. Available from: Touchstone Applied Science Associates, Inc., Fields Lane, P.O. Box 382, Brewster, NY 10509, 914-277-4900.**

The *Degrees of Reading Power* has passages of increasing reading difficulty in each of which seven words are missing. Students must select the word that best completes the meaning of each incomplete sentence. The rationale is that students must understand the extended context of the passage in order to select the correct words. This is not a vocabulary test. The test identifies the hardest prose that pupils can read with different levels of comprehension.

(TC#440.3DEGOFR)

Dole, Janice, Gerald Duffy, Laura Roeher, and David Pearson. ***Moving From the Old to the New: Research on Reading Comprehension Instruction.*** **Located in: Review of Educational Research, 61, Summer 1991, pp. 239-264.**

Although not specifically about assessment instruments in reading, this article provides a good overview of current cognitive research on reading. The article is included here because, in order to wisely choose assessment instruments, one needs a clear idea of the target to be assessed.

The article clearly describes the view that reading comprehension is constructive; readers use their existing knowledge and a range of cues from the text and the situational context

in which the reading occurs to build, or construct, a model of meaning from the text. This developing view of the reading process is contrasted with the view underlying past instructional practices. The authors then outline what a reading curriculum would look like that is based on a cognitive view of the reading process.

Finally, the authors outline current theories of instruction, and how they might be applied to a cognitive reading curriculum.

(TC#440.6MOVFRO)

Eeds, Maryann. *Holistic Assessment of Coding Ability.* Located in: Susan Glazer, Lyndon Searfoss, and Lance Gentile (Eds.), Reexamining Reading Diagnosis: New Trends and Procedures, 1988, pp. 48-66. Available from: International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Rd., P.O. Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714.

The author focuses on the "coding" aspect of reading (i.e., the relationship between sounds and symbols). However, she emphasizes that mere mastery of the code will not solve all reading problems; there must be both a code and a language emphasis (syntax, semantics, and the context in which reading occurs) for successful literacy programs. After establishing this point, she goes on to outline how knowledge of the code develops, and discusses some informal diagnostic procedures to discover where children are in the process of breaking the code. She suggests three categories of procedures: careful observance of children's writing, close attention to what students say about their discoveries about print as they learn to write, and qualitative consideration of their miscues as they read whole text.

Specifically, the author shows how the following ideas allow one to assess students' mastery of the coding system:

1. Concepts about print assess students' knowledge of what print is and does. The author includes a summary of nine tasks for students to perform in order to assess this ability.

2. Examination of writing can give hints as to the students' understanding of directionality, letters, etc. The author describes in some detail how the examination of spelling (or invented spelling) can provide information about development, including a detailed developmental framework with four stages.

3. Miscues during oral reading can help determine what clues students use to create meaning -- syntax, semantic, etc.

(TC#440.3HOLASC)

Eggleton, Jill. *Whole Language Evaluation: Reading, Writing and Spelling*, 1990. Available from: The Wright Group, 18916 North Creek Parkway, Bothell, WA 98011.

The author ties three stages of development in reading, writing, and spelling to instruction and provides many samples of ways to assess to determine stage and skill attainment: rating scales, checklists, and anecdotal records. She also briefly discusses self-reflection.

Two books (grades K-3 and 4-6) are designed for informal classroom use. Each subject and developmental level contains sections entitled: teacher goals (instructional ideas),

student goals (things for students to accomplish), assessment/monitoring techniques, and reporting progress.

The activities are good, but the author assumes a certain amount of expertise about reading; writing, and spelling on the part of users because of a lack of complete definitions for items on checklists. Samples of student work, provided to illustrate the developmental stages, are mostly only given in writing. No technical information is available.

(TC#400.3WHOLAR)

Fagan, William T., Julie M. Jensen, and Charles R. Cooper. *Measures for Research and Evaluation in the English Language Arts, Vol. 2*, 1985. Available from: National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, IL 61801, 217-328-3870.

This book contains a number of scoring guides for assessing various targets in reading, literature, writing and oral communication.

(TC#430.1MEAREE2)

Farr, Roger; and Robert F. Carey. *Reading: What Can Be Measured?*, 1986. Available from: International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Rd., P.O. Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714.

This book is an anthology of articles concerning issues surrounding the assessment of reading, guidelines for the improved use of reading tests, trends in assessing reading, and various ways to assess reading comprehension, word recognition, vocabulary, study skills, and reading rate.

This book is more a review of issues and procedures than detailed instruction in how to assess using a given approach.

(TC#440.6REAWHC)

Farr, Roger, Mary Lewis, Jean Faszhoz, Ellen Pinsky, Sarah Towe, Judy Lipschutz, and Betty Faulds. *Writing in Response To Reading.* Located in: Educational Leadership, 47, March 1990, pp. 66-69. Also available from: River Forest School District Administration Building, 7776 Lake St., River Forest, IL 60305.

River Forest Pubic Schools has been developing a reading/writing program since 1987. In this program, students use reading as a prompt for writing, and writing as an indicator of how well the reading was understood. Three types of writing are used: retelling, extending (e.g., new endings), and critiquing. This paper briefly describes this program (including some of the instructional activities used), and provides an overview of an assessment system devised to see how student achievement on these tasks changes over time.

Standardized reading/writing tasks were devised for grades 3, 6 and 8 that paralleled the three types of writing encouraged in instruction. Included in the article is one prompt used in the assessment, plus a set of scoring criteria for grade 3, and one anchor paper.

(TC#440.3WRIINR)

Fisher, Bobbi. ***Assessing Emergent and Initial Readers.*** **Located in: Teaching K-8, Nov/Dec 1989, pp. 56-58.**

This is one teacher's description of how she keeps track of her kindergartners' reading and writing progress during the school year. For example, at the beginning of the school year, she:

1. Tape-records an interview with the student covering four categories of information: general interests, the reading and writing environment at home, general knowledge about reading and writing, and the reading and writing process.

2. Observes children reading and makes systematic notes using various checklists and a reading developmental continuum.

3. Observes students writing, and conferences with each student.

4. Uses the "Letter Identification" procedure used by Marie Clay.

She has set up similar procedures for monitoring student progress during the school year, and conducting a year-end assessment.

No technical information is available.

(TC#440.6ASSEMA)

Flood, James, and Diane Lapp. ***Reporting Reading Progress: A Comparison Portfolio for Parents.*** **Located in: The Reading Teacher, March 1989, pp. 508-514.**

This article describes the content of a reading (and writing) portfolio for each student that can be used to show progress to parents.

(TC#400.3REPREP)

Fredericks, Anthony, and Timothy Rasinski. ***Involving Parents in the Assessment Process.*** **Located in: The Reading Teacher, 44, 1990, pp. 346-349.**

The authors maintain that parents should be invited to participate in all aspects of the classroom reading program. This enables parents to understand the complexity of the reading process and reading instruction, observe growth more directly and understand what they can do to help. The authors suggest several ways to get parents involved. Examples are:

1. Early in the school year, provide a means for parents to state individual expectations for their child.

2. Develop simple question sheets for parents to use to assess reading progress. (Two such sheets are included in the article.)

3. Frequently ask parents to compose lists of things their children have learned in reading.

(TC#440.3INVPAA)

Gillet, Jean, and Charles Temple. *Understanding Reading Problems: Assessment and Instruction, Third Edition*, 1990. Available from: Harper-Collins Publishers, 1000 Keystone Industrial Park, Scranton, PA 18512, 800-242-7737.

This book starts by describing (1) how literacy develops and the types of things students need to know and be able to do in order to learn to be literate, and (2) the types of problems students run into that hinder their learning to be proficient. Then the authors systematically describe various assessment techniques to determine whether students have the prerequisite knowledge for learning to read or to determine the nature of the reading problems they are having. There is an especially good discussion of development, concepts about print, and miscue analysis. The strength of this book is that the authors describe what you need to know, why you need to know it, and how you get the information. They also provide the "so what" -- instructional strategies for various kinds of problems.

The only weakness might be in the lack of a statement of the ulitmate target of reading instruction -- what do we ultimately want readers to be like? What is an expert reader? Because of this lack of a concrete statement, we are left to infer the target from the assessment devices and instructional methods discussed. It is more difficult to see how it all fits together, and some aspects of good reading may be under-emphasized, for example, metacognition and attitudes.

(TC#440.6UNDRPR)

Glaser, S.M., L.W. Searfoss, and L.M. Gentile. *Reexamining Reading Diagnosis New Trends and Procedures*, 1988. Available from: International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Rd., P.O. Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714.

This book is a compendium of articles covering a variety of topics. This reviewer found the following of most use: using student "think alouds" to analyze reading strategies and self-monitoring (p. 94); checklists for developmental stages in early reading and writing that can be used to analyze student progress (p. 48); informally monitoring student knowledge of text structures (p. 103); and a checklist for analyzing student retelling of stories (p. 139).

(TC#440.6REARED)

Goodman, Kenneth, Lois Bridges Bird, and Yetta Goodman. *The Whole Language Catalog Supplement on Authentic Assessment*, 1992. Available from: American School Publishers, 1221 Farmers Lane, Suite C, Santa Rosa, CA 95405, 800-882-2502.

This large publication is a compendium of case studies, philosophy statements, and examples of assessment ideas for use by teachers to look at student progress in reading, writing, spelling, and oral language. Although the major chapters focus on philosophy, the teacher as a professional, self evaluation, assessment methods, and specific assessment ideas, the organization is inductive -- many vignettes and samples intended to provide ideas to knowledgeable teachers.

There are especially good sections on miscue analysis (what it is, how to do it, and many student samples), the philosophy of whole language, the teacher as constructor of meaning, and ideas for student self reflection and evaluation. It also has lots of sample report cards, and good ideas for evaluating a literate environment and parent involvement. One strength is that it doesn't just list information collection techniques,

but also outlines the sorts of things you look for in student performance or work to help guage progress.

If there are weaknesses in this publication it would be, first, that there is no overview of targets for students: what does a good reader or writer look like, and how do the various suggestions for data collection provide evidence of progress toward these targets? Lots of samples and ideas are given but without an organizing principle. (This is why I call the publication inductive. One builds the definition of targets from the samples given.) For example, one checklist has you note whether students "enjoy working at the writing table." You have to both infer why this is important, and take it on faith that this is more important to collect than some other indicator.

Secondly, although lists of things to look for in student performance and work are given, they are frequently undefined. For example, one rating form has you note student "use of prior knowledge and context to draw concusions and make predictions." Will anything count? Will teachers be consistent in their judgements?

Thus, this publication is probably most useful for inductive thinkers and already knowledgeable teachers who are looking for ideas.

(TC#400.6WHOLAC)

Grant, Audrey. *Towards a Transactive Theory of the Reading Process and Research in Evaluation*. Located in: Sue Legg and James Algina (Eds.), Cognitive Assessment of Language and Math Outcomes, 1990, pp. 192-240. Available from: Ablex Publishing Corp., 355 Chestnut St., Norwood, NJ 07648.

The author compares previous theories of reading (which she calls "product" theories) with current constructionist theories (which she calls "process" theories), and expands the notion of process theories to "transactive" theories, in which the meaning a reader brings to the text is personal, creative, and colored by past experiences (e.g., the whole context under which previous reading experiences occurred). After describing these various theories, the author draws some implications for instruction and assessment.

Specifically, the author recommends a holistic, ethnographic approach to assessment based on day-to-day classroom activities and settings. She also reviews common assessment techniques in light of her perspective on the reading process. These reviews include: miscue analysis, cloze, running records, informal reading inventories, and individual conference logs.

(TC#440.1TOWTRT)

Griffin, Patrick, Cherry Jones, Meredith Maher, James Mount, Sue O'Brien, Des Ryan, Patricia Smith, Anne Smyth, and Graeme Baker. *Literacy Profiles Handbook: Assessing and Reporting Literacy Development*, 1990. Available from: School Programs Division, Ministry of Education, Victoria Australia. Also available from: TASA, Field's Lane, P.O. Box 382, Brewster, NY 10509, 914-277-4900.

The *Literacy Profiles Handbook* describes student proficiency in reading and writing in terms of developmental continua. There are nine bands that describe clusters of behaviors from the least to the most sophisticated. For example, writing band "A" denotes such student behaviors as: "uses writing implement to make marks on paper," and "comments on signs and other symbols in immediate environment." Writing band

"I" denotes such behaviors as: "writes with ease in both short passages and extended writing," and "extended arguments are conveyed through writing."

The booklet also: (1) provides some guidance on how to make and record observations, including the classroom tasks within which teachers might make their observations; and (2) discusses how to promote consistency in judgments between teachers (without using technical terminology).

The authors point out the benefits of this approach--the bands direct teachers' attention to growth in literacy, they give teachers a common vocabulary for talking about such growth, and they allow students and parents to observe growth.

The handbook is designed for informal classroom use. No technical information is available.

(TC#400.3LITPRO)

Hansen, Jane. *Literacy Portfolios: Helping Students Know Themselves*, 1992. Located in: Educational Leadership, 49, pp. 66-68. Also available from: University of New Hampshire, Morrill Hall, Curham, NH 03825.

This short article provides a good idea of what a literacy portfolio is and the positive effects the process can have on students. The author describes a K-12 project in which students are completely in control of what goes in their portfolios, and any rationale is accepted at face value. The idea is to build self esteem and to help students get to know who they are as readers. Items from outside of school are encouraged. There is also some help in the article with how to get started and how to promote self reflection.

There is no discussion of criteria, but there are some examples of what students placed in their portfolios and why.

(TC#400.3LITPOH)

Hetterscheidt, Judy, Lynn Pott, Kenneth Russell, and Jakke Tchang. *Using the Computer as a Reading Portfolio*, 1992. Located in: Educational Leadership, 49, p. 73. Also available from: Bellerive School, 666 Rue De Fleur, Creve Coeur, MO 63141.

The authors briefly describe their use of a commercially available Macintosh HyperCard system that allows their fifth grade students to scan writing, record themselves reading and giving self-evaluations, and keep track of comments and other notes. The emphasis is on recording progress and allowing for self reflection--samples are entered at various regular times in the school year.

(TC#400.3USICOR)

Illinois State Board of Education. *Illinois Goal Assessment Program--Reading Tests*, 1991. Available from: Tom Kerins (Manager), Illinois State Board of Education, 100 N. First St., Springfield, IL 62777.

This document contains the 1991 versions of Illinois' grade 3, 6, 8, and 11 reading tests. As with previous tests, these attempt to incorporate current theories of reading, even though they are in multiple-choice format. Features include: students read entire selections rather than short passages; students are asked about prior knowledge of the topic; questions are based on important concepts in the text; students answer questions

about reading strategies; there are attitude questions on some forms; all questions have one to three correct answers; and students read two passages -- narrative and expository.

(TC#440.3ILLGOR2)

International Reading Association. ***Portfolios Illuminate the Path for Dynamic, Interactive Readers.*** **Located in: Journal of Reading, May 1990, pp. 644-647.**

This paper discusses the importance of classroom assessment in reading and how portfolios are one tool for this purpose. The authors present a general overview of what could be accomplished with students by doing portfolios, the importance of student self-reflection, and how portfolios might be used in the classroom.

(TC#440.6PORILP)

Johnston, Peter. ***Steps Toward a More Naturalistic Approach to the Assessment of the Reading Process.*** **Located in: Sue Legg and James Algina (Eds.), Cognitive Assessment of Language and Math Outcomes, 1990. Available from: Ablex Publishing Corp., 355 Chestnut St., Norwood, NJ 07648.**

This chapter presents a rationale and guidelines for a more naturalistic approach to reading assessment. Such assessment consists of observations of children's performance of the behaviors to be assessed as they occur within the context in which they would normally occur. The chapter discusses the nature of decision making in education, the process of assessment from a naturalistic standpoint, the aspects of reading which should be assessed, and a contrast of the naturalistic approach to more traditional assessment approaches.

In order to really be able to implement his ideas, several things must be done, including:

1. Teachers need to be helped to become sensitive observers and interpreters of children's behavior; the teacher is the assessment instrument.

2. There is still some work to be done in clarifying the knowledge and behaviors that are the targets of assessment.

(TC#440.6STETOM)

Kay, Gary. ***A Thinking Twist On the Multiple-Choice Question.*** **Located in: Journal of Reading, 36, 1992, pp. 56-57.**

The author uses a skills-based test with a twist -- he has his community college students write down why they selected the answer they did and say why at least one of the other answers was wrong. He briefly describes the kinds of useful information that can be obained in this way. This is, of course, an informal procedure and no technical information is available.

(TC#440.6THITWM)

Kinney, Martha, and Ann Harry. ***An Informal Inventory for Adolescents That Assesses the Reader, the Text, and the Task.*** **Located in: Journal of Reading, 34, 1991, pp. 643-647.**

The authors describe an informal procedure for assessing reading from a constructivist viewpoint. They use the procedure in grades 6-8 to look at use of prior knowledge, use of text structure, making inferences, etc.

The authors provide some guidelines for selecting a text, making an outline of the knowledge structure of the text (to compare to student retellings), assessing prior knowledge (brainstorming and defining related vocabulary), assessing ability to gain information from reading (recalls, identifying referents and inference questions), and using the information once gathered. The authors also illustrate each step with an example.

The method is theory based and well thought out, but no technical information is provided.

(TC#440.6INFINA)

Kletzien, Sharon B. and Maryanne R. Bednar. ***Dynamic Assessment for At-Risk Readers.*** **Located in: Journal of Reading, April 1990, pp. 528-533.**

The Dynamic Assessment Procedure (DAP) involves the following components:

1. An initial assessment of reading ability
2. Analysis of a student's reading processes and strategies
3. Presentation of a learning mini-lesson for one area in which the student needs assistance
4. Analysis of the student's ability to benefit from the mini-lesson

(TC#440.3DYNASF)

Knight, Janice. ***Coding Journal Entries.*** **Located in: Journal of Reading, 34, 1990, pp. 42-47.**

This article describes a system for coding reading journal entries to promote student self-reflection and improve reading strategies and comprehension. The impetus for this system came from the author's observation that many reading journal entries were only superficial summaries of what was read. The author wanted to make journal entries more meaningful.

Each journal entry is coded by the student and/or teacher on level of thinking, metacognitive strategies, and confusion. Examples are:

1. Level of thinking--"R" means "recall," and "$\circlearrowleft$" means "inference, prediction, or cause and effect.
2. Metacognitive strategy--"S" means "summarize," and "SQ" means "self-questioning."

3. Confusion--"O" means that the entry does not say anything significant, and "?" means that the entry indicated student confusion.

The promise of this system is that the coding system is integrated with instruction so that students learn what good reading strategies are, and then assess them in their own journal entries.

There is, however, no assistance with standards--what to expect from students of various ages and how to tell if students are progressing at an acceptable rate.

(TC#440.3CODJOE)

Larter, S. *Benchmarks: The Development of a New Approach To Student Evaluation*, 1991. Available from: Toronto Board of Education, 155 College Street, Toronto, ON, M5T 1P6, Canada.

Benchmarks are student performance assessment tasks tied to Provincial Educational goals. Each Benchmark lists the goals that are addressed, the task, and the holistic scale used to judge performance. The holistic scale changes for each task. Students are also rated on perserverance, confidence, willingness, and prior knowledge, depending on the Benchmark. There are 129 Benchmarks developed in language and mathematics for grades 3, 6, and 8.

The percent of students in the sample tested at each score point (e.g., 1-5) are given for comparison purposes, as are other statistics (such as norms), when appropriate. Anchor performances (e.g., what a "3" performance looks like) are available either on video or in hard copy.

This report describes the philosophy behink the Benchmarks and how they were developed. Some sample Benchmarks (without anchor performances) are provided in the appendices.

(TC#100.6BENCHM)

Lidz, Carol. *Dynamic Assessment: An Interactional Approach to Evaluating Learning Potential*, 1987. Available from: Guilford Press, 72 Spring Street, New York, NY 10012, 800-365-7006.

Dynamic assessment is an interaction between an examiner and a learner which seeks to determine the degree to which cognitive functioning can be modified, and the best way to accomplish the modification. In other words, the examiner not only tries to determine what individuals are able to do now, but also how fast they can gain new skills and the best way to teach them.

This book focuses on dynamic assessment with respect to learning potential or cognitive functioning (the building blocks of learning). The functions looked at resemble those found on intelligence or ability tests: verbal and nonverbal skills, use of analogy, induction and part-whole analysis, etc. The goal of the book is to explore the state-of-the-art.

Dynamic assessment in this book parallels the use of the term in other entries in this bibliography -- test, teach, and retest to determine both current level of skill and

speed/style of learning. The content area differs, however, from other entries. This book focuses on cognitive skills rather than performance in academic areas.

(TC#150.6DYNASS)

Lidz, Carol. *Practitioner's Guide to Dynamic Assessment*, 1991. Available from: Guilford Press, 72 Spring St., New York, NY 10012, 800-365-7006.

This book updates the information in the author's previous work (see 150.6DYNASS) and presents some implications for practitioners. Dynamic assessment involves the following features:

1. The assessor actively works to facilitate learning and induce active participation in the learner.

2. The assessment focuses on processes rather than products.

3. The assessment produces information about learner modifiability and the means by which change is best accomplished.

The procedure should be employed when the question about a student relates to the responsiveness of the learner to intervention, the repertory of problem-solving processes or stretegies employed, and the means by which change is best effected. The repertory of problem-solving processes include such things as: selecting and applying strategies and processes relevant to the task; good memory storage and retrieval; flexible application of strategies; inhibition of impulsivity to allow for adequate application of strategies; efficiency; active involvement in learning; and concern with adequacy of solutions. In addition to assessing children's ability in these areas, the assessor also tries to mediate (teach or provide hints) to modify them. Such mediations (MLEs, or Mediated Learning Experiences) can be targeted at any of the processes listed above; for example, the mediator can attempt to mediate feelings of competence, control of behavior, task interest bridges to previous experience, or focus on the task.

The author describes some major applications of this approach -- examination of general problem-solving abilities, a substitute for intelligence testing, and application to academic content (beginning reading and math).

However, the majority of the book is devoted to the presentation of two assessment devices developed by the author: The *Mediated Learning Experience Rating Scale* and the *Preschool Learning Assessment Device*. The former is designed to assess the types of mediations that occur between adults and children. The latter is designed to assess the status and modifiability of preschool student problem-solving abilities. Although the approach is general problem solving, there is some discussion of applying it to specific content areas.

(TC#000.3FRAGUD)

Lock, Leonard, Leann Miler, and James Masters. *A Preliminary Evaluation of Pennsylvania's 1990 Wholistic Model Reading Tests*, 1991. Available from: Pennsylvania Department of Education, Division of Educational Testing and Evaluation (12th Floor), 333 Market St., P.O. Box 911, Harrisburg, PA 17126.

Pennsylvania has modified it's statewide reading assessment of students in grades 3, 5, and 8 to include complete passages, comprehension questions based on the passages (43-

48 questions), prior knowledge of the topics covered in the passages (7-8 questions), reading strategies (5-10 questions), and habits/attitudes (3-4 questions). This is very similar to the procedure used in Michigan and Illinois. This entry describes the results of the first year of this assessment. Results included the findings that:

1. Scores increased as prior knowledge of the students increased, and as knowledge of strategies increased.

2. Students seemed to answer the attitude questions honestly based on several lines of evidence.

The term "wholistic" in the title appears to refer to the attempt to measure all aspects of good reading using a more realistic approach, rather than to how student performances were scored. (Indeed, multiple-choice questions were used.)

(TC#440.3PREEVO)

Mathews, Jackie. *From Computer Management To Portfolio Assessment.* Located in: The Reading Teacher, February 1990, pp. 420-421.

This article describes the basic design of a reading portfolio for grades K-2. The four core elements are: a reading development checklist, writing samples, a list of books read by the student, and a test of reading comprehension. Optional elements include student self-evaluation, reading records, audiotapes, anecdotal records, pages from reading logs, or other measures a teacher or student feels would illustrate the growth of the student as a language learner.

The reading development checklist includes concepts about print, attitudes about reading, strategies for word identification, and comprehension strategies. (Some of the individual items on the checklist are presented in the article.) The reading comprehension test was still under development at the time of this article.

The article also describes other necessary components for an innovation of this type: administrative support, a climate for change, experts in the area of reading, a good staff development program, and grass roots interest.

(TC#440.6FROCOM)

McCormick, Sandra, Robert Cooter, and John McEneaney. *Assessment of Disabled Readers: A Survey of Current Teacher Beliefs and Practices.* Located in: Journal of Reading, 35, 1992, pp. 597-599.

This paper reports on an International Reading Association survey of membership to find out current teacher beliefs and practices concerning assessment. Results are very interesting. For example, in response to the question "What specific questions would you like to have answered about the assessment of disabled readers?" the five most common responses were:

1. How can assessment information be translated into instructional practice?

2. What do research and practice suggest is the best approach to assessment?

3. How are portfolios and writing assessment being used to assess disabled readers?

4. What are whole language assessment techniques and how do they compare to traditional diagnostic methods?

5. What is the role of attitude, home environment, and parental involvement in diagnosis and remediation?

This might be useful for planning inservice events.

(TC#440.6ASSDIR)

McEneaney, John. *Computer-Assisted Diagnosis in Reading: An Expert Systems Approach.* Located in: Journal of Reading, 36, 1992, pp. 36-47.

The author describes what experts systems are, the potential usefulness to education (development requires diagnosticians to systematize their thinking about what to assess and how to assess it), provides a warning about most commercially available "shell" software, and describes one expert system in detail: The Teacher's Aide.

The Teacher's Aide bases diagnosis on student information (age, grade, etc.), informal reading inventory information (word recognition, comprehension, and miscues), word lists, and other standardized measures. As such, it is a very traditional, skills-based approach. Future versions will help with instructional ideas.

(TC#440.3COMDIR)

McKenna, Michael, and Dennis Kear. *Measuring Attitude Toward Reading: A New Tool for Teachers.* Located in: The Reading Teacher, 43, 1990, pp. 626-639.

This paper reports on the development of the *Elementary Reading Attitude Survey* for use in grades 1-6. There are 20 items, 10 on academic reading and 10 on recreational reading. Students read each question (such as "How do you feel about spending free time reading?") and then indicate their response by circling one of four Garfield cartoon characters drawn to show different levels of excitement or boredom. The complete instrument, along with administration instructions and norms (based on 18,000 students) are included. Some reliability and validity information is also given. As with other measures of this type, estimating validity is problematic because it involves identifying other measures of attitude with which to compose self ratings. In this case, the authors compared self ratings to whether the student had a library card, the number of books currently checked out, and of television watched, and to holistic teacher ratings of teacher ability. Because of the inherent conceptual problems here, the instrument looks best used informally.

(TC#440.3MEATOR)

McTighe, Jay. *Maryland School Performance Assessment Program -- Reading, Writing, Language Arts,* 1991. Available from: Maryland Department of Education, 200 W. Baltimore St., Baltimore, MD 21201, 301-333-2390.

This document contains: Maryland's philosophy for developing performance assessments, statements of targets in reading, language arts and math, a description of the *Dimensions of Thinking* framework published by ASCD and adopted by Maryland to development assessments of student thinking, and a description of Maryland's thematic reading tests.

The reading targets include reading for different purposes, constructing meaning from the text using reading skills, strategies, and background knowledge, and interacting in different ways with various types of texts. The "thematic" reading format involves using the same passage and answering series of short answer questions, and then writing an essay.

(TC#400.3MDRWLA)

Meltzer, Lynn J. *Surveys of Problem-Solving & Educational Skills*, 1987. Available from: Educator's Publishing Service, Inc., 75 Moulton St., Cambridge, MA 02138.

Although this is a test published primarily for diagnosing learning disabilities for students aged 9-14, it has some interesting ideas that could be more generally applied. There are two parts to the test--a more-or-less standard, individualized aptitude test, and a series of achievement subtests. In addition to decoding skills, vocabulary knowledge, and the ability to separate words in a paragraph that has no word spacing, the reading subtest also requires an oral retelling of a story and oral responses to comprehension questions. The oral retelling is scored on order of recall, amount of recall, and the recall of important ideas in the passage.

The most interesting part of this test, however, is that after each subtest is administered, the teacher is guided through an analysis of the student's strategies in completing the task--efficiency of approaching tasks, flexibility in applying strategies, style of approaching tasks, attention to the task, and responsiveness during assessment. In the aptitude portion of the test, the teacher also assesses the student's ability to explain their own strategies.

A review in *The Reading Teacher*, November 1989, concluded that, since there is little evidence of validity presented by the author, the test should be used informally for classroom assessment. The reviewer also states: "The SPES, rather than attempting to measure underlying cognitive abilities, instead appears to emphasize underlying strategy awareness and use. This orientation appears to reflect the important recent developments in educational thinking, emphasizing the child as a problem solver who uses intentionally selected strategies to improve understanding and learning." (p. 176)

(TC#010.3SUROFP)

Meyers, Joel, Susan Lytle, Donna Palladino, Gillian Devenpeck, and Michael Green. *Think-Aloud Protocol Analysis: An Investigation of Reading Comprehension Strategies in Fourth- and Fifth-Grade Students.* Located in: Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 8, 1990, pp. 112-127.

The authors looked at the degree to which grade 4 and 5 students used such reading strategies as reasoning, elaboration, signaling understanding, analysis, judging, and monitoring doubts while they were reading three fictional passages. Use of strategies was stable across passages for the students. Reasoning and signaling understanding was significantly related to reading comprehension.

The list of strategies is provided, but there are no samples of student speech to illustrate them. The authors feel that think-alouds will eventually be a useful procedure to assess the reading strategies that students use.

(TC#440.3THIALP)

Morrow, Lesley. *Retelling Stories as a Diagnostic Tool.* Located in: Susan Glazer, Lyndon Searfoss, and Lance Gentile (Eds.), Reexamining Reading Diagnosis: New Trends and Procedures, 1988, pp. 128-149. Available from: International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Rd., P.O. Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714, 302-731-1600

The author describes retelling as an instructional and diagnostic tool for assessing comprehension of text and stories, sense of story structure, and language complexity. The paper provides a set of instructions to guide the retelling, and specific suggestions for how to use retelling to examine comprehension, story structure, and language complexity.

With respect to comprehension, the author provides a sample checklist to use when reviewing retellings to guide the teacher's attention to relevant features. With respect to story structure, the author provides an example of how to analyze a retelling to show knowledge of setting, theme, resolution, and sequence. Finally, with respect to language complexity, the author presents one technique for analyzing the retelling for average length of clauses and syntactic complexity.

There is no assistance with developmental issues, i.e., what is "good" for students of various ages.

(TC#440.3RETSTD)

Mossenson, Leila, Peter Hill, and Geofferey Masters. *(TORCH) Tests of Reading Comprehension*, 1988. Available from: Australian Council for Educational Research, Ltd., Radford House, Frederick Street, Hawthorn, Victoria 3122, Australia.

TORCH is a set of 14 untimed reading tests for use with students in grades 3-10 that try to assess the extent to which readers are able to obtain meaning from text.

There are 14 graded passages from 200 to 900 words long. Students are presented with the text and with a retelling of the text which leaves out certain details from the original. Students complete the retelling by filling in the gaps. Responses are short -- at most 10 words. Each gap (item) is tied to one of 11 reading tasks/skills; in order to fill in the gaps, the student must use one of the 11 skills. (Examples are: complete simple rewordings, connect ideas separated in the text, and infer emotion.)

This is administered as a group test, with student responses in written form. Students do not respond to all passages, only those corresponding to their reading ability. Student responses are scored "acceptable" or "not acceptable" by comparison to models provided in the scoring guide. Results are interpreted by noting which reading tasks the student is likely to be able to perform (e.g., finding facts), and which he or she will be unlikely to perform (e.g., providing a detail in the presence of distracting ideas). (Items were placed along a continuum of difficulty using latent-trait techniques. Theoretically, this allows the user to compare results between passages and to place all skills/tasks along a single continuum of difficulty. This makes it possible to predict which tasks a student is likely to be able to do and which he or she is not likely to be able to do.)

(TC#440.3TORCHT)

Paratore, Jeanne R., and Roselmina Indrisano. ***Intervention Assessment of Reading Comprehension.*** **Located in: The Reading Teacher, April 1987, pp. 778-783.**

This article describes an assessment procedure designed to both assess a student's present performance and to discover the facility with which a student can be taught. The procedure examines the student's ability to employ reading strategies (such as using background knowledge to predict passage content and using knowledge of passage structure to aid comprehension) both independently, and with modeling, if needed.

(TC#440.3INTASO)

Paris, Scott, Barbara Wasik, and Gert Van der Westhuizen. ***Meta-Metacognition: A Review of Research on Metacognition and Reading.*** **Located in: John Readence, Scott Baldwin, John Konopak, and Patricia O'Keefe (Eds.), Dialogues in Literacy Research, 1988. Available from: National Reading Conference, Inc., 11 East Hubbard, Suite 200, Chicago, IL 60622, 312-329-2512.**

This article reviews the literature on metacognition up to 1988. Although not strictly about assessment, it is included here to help define what metacogntion is. Metacognition is d8efined as "cognitive self-appraisal and self-management" -- awareness of how one goes about doing a task, and monitoring/revising the procedure as necessary. The authors conclude that most of the publications extol the virtues of metacognition without any empirical studies that this can help students become more proficient readers. Likewise, many of the instructional interventions are not highly driven by a detailed theory of metacognition, but only from loose definitions that are not tied to any developmental or instructional framework. They urge that more empirical attention needs to be given to this construct so that instructional materials are more soundly grounded.

(However, since this paper was written in 1988, there may have been additional research in the intervening years that may shed more light on metacognition.)

(TC#440.6METRER)

Phillips, Linda. ***Developing and Validating Assessments of Inference Ability in Reading Comprehension,*** **1989. Available from: Center for the Study of Reading, Technical Report No. 452, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 51 Gerty Dr., Champaign, IL 61820.**

This package includes a technical report describing the development of a reading inference test and the tests themselves. There are two versions of the test--multiple choice and open-ended response.

The author begins by critiquing current standardized tests of reading comprehension. The arguments are somewhat different from others: they seem to test general knowledge more than reading comprehension; and, they do not articulate a clear definition of reading comprehension so validation is impossible.

The *Test of Inference Ability* was designed to measure only one component of reading comprehension--inferencing ability. It was designed for grades 6-8, to be given in one class period, and uses full-length passages in three modes: expository, narrative and descriptive.

The basic approach to validation was that the test would be valid to the extent that good inference-making led to good performance on the test and poor inference-making led to poor performance on the test. In order to distinguish good inference-making from poor, the authors had to describe and define what those differences are. Inferences in reading comprehension tend to be good to the extent that a reader integrates relevant text information and relevant background knowledge to construct interpretations that more completely and more consistently explain the meaning of the text than alternative interpretations. Their definition basically hinges on completeness and consistency. This is elaborated on in the manual.

A published version of the instrument (manual, multiple-choice version, and constructed response version) is in TC#440.3TESINA)

(TC#440.3DEVVAA)

Phillips, Linda. *Test of Inference Ability in Reading Comprehension*, 1989. Available from: Institute for Educational Research and Development, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, NF, A1B 3X8, Canada, 709-737-2345.

This is a published version of TC#440.3DEVVAA. Information, not included in the above reference are added here. The test consists of three full-length stories -- UFOs (exposition), Money (description), and The Wrong Newspapers (narration). Each story consists of four to five paragraphs with questions after each, for a total of 12 questions per story. The questions for the multiple-choice version and the constructed-response versions are the same.

In the multiple-choice version the students can earn from 0 to 3 points depending on his or her choice. Three points are awarded when the choice is both consistent and complete, two for a partially correct answer, 1 for a text-based answer and 0 for a wrong answer. The constructed-response version also assigns 0-3 points for each response; the multiple-choice options are given as models for assigning points.

Thus, this is midway between being an open-response test (right answers established ahead of time) and an open-ended test (more than one right answer, with the quality of the reasoning being the feature judged). In this case, the right answer is a stand-in for the thinking process, and the authors only kept items for which the students gave the right answer for the right reason.

The performance criteria are also tied directly to each item. This impedes the user from generalizing what "complete" and "consistent" are so that these concepts can be used in other reading situations. However, at the end of the manual the authors do provide a generalized holistic 0-3 scale for judging completeness and consistency and provide the reasoning behind assigning some of the responses to different point values. This provides some of the help needed to apply the concepts of consistency and completeness to other reading tasks.

All in all this appears to be a fairly well thought out and researched instrument.

(TC#440.3TESINA)

Phillips-Riggs, Linda. ***Categories of Inferencing Strategies*****, 1981. Located in: W.T. Fagan, J.M. Jensen, and C.R. Cooper (Eds.),** **Measures for Research and Evaluation in the English Language Arts, Vol. 2, 1985. Available from: NCTE, 1111 Kenyon Rd., Urbana, IL 61801, 800-369-6283. Also available from ERIC: ED 236 667.**

This procedure requires students to read up to a certain point where an inference is required. (This point is determined by the examiner.) The student is then asked to tell what is happening and what may happen next. Responses are analyzed in terms of the strategies used. The ten strategies suggested by the author include: analyzing alternatives, confirming an immediate prior interpretation, shifting focus, and assigning an alternative case.

(TC#440.3CATOFI)

Pikulski, John. ***The Assessment of Reading: A Time For Change?*** **Located in: The Reading Teacher, October 1989, pp. 80-81.**

The author presents a listing of ways that assessment in reading needs to change. His suggestions are based on standardized, nationally normed tests. His suggestions include comments such as: "Assessment of reading must shift from being test-centered to being teacher- and pupil-centered," and "The form of reading assessment must reflect the goals of instruction and the dynamic, constructionist nature of the reading process." The author then goes on to describe how *The Reading Teacher* intends to modify the content of it's *Assessment* column to reflect these new directions.

(TC#440.6ASSREA)

Pikulski, John. ***Informal Reading Inventories.*** **Located in: The Reading Teacher, March 1990, pp. 514-516.**

This article describes the latest editions of four popular informal reading inventories: Analytic Reading Inventory (ARI--1989), Basic Reading Inventory (BRI--1988), Classroom Reading Inventory (CRI--1989), and Informal Reading Inventory (IRI-BR--1989). The author feels that the IRI-BR and the ARI have the greatest breadth of assessment materials; that the ARI would be the inventory of choice for an examiner who wants to assess science and social studies; the CRI would be good for disabled readers; and the IRI-BR is best for assessing reading beyond grade nine difficulty.

(TC#440.1INFREI)

Portland Pubic Schools. ***Reading Assessment: Recording Student Progress*****, 1989. Available from: Portland Public Schools, P. O. Box 3107, Portland, OR 97208, 503-249-2000.**

Portland Public Schools has assembled a package of informal classroom assessment tools in reading for students in grades K-2. The goal of the package is to provide ideas to teachers on how to assess other things besides specific reading skills. Specifically, they feel that assessment must include a variety of tools that provide evidence of what a student does and thinks when reading as well as evaluating specific strengths and weaknesses. In order to provide a complete picture of student progress, many samples of student work need to be collected over time. This implies the use of portfolios.

Specific instruments in the package include a developmental spelling test; a checklist covering reading attitudes, behaviors, concepts about print, reading strategies, shared and book experiences; an inventory concerning reading habits, suggestions for reading

journals; a procedure for analyzing comprehension using retelling; and a series of checklists that covers such things as concepts about books, sense of story, and understanding of print. When the instrument provided came from another source, the reference is given. The rationale for each instrument is provided; no technical information is provided.

(TC#440.3REAASR)

Pumphrey, P.D. ***Reading: Tests and Assessment Techniques, Second Edition*****, 1985. Available from: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., Mill Road, Dunton Green, Sevenoaks, Kent, England, UK. Also available from: International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Rd., P.O. Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714, 302-731-1600.**

This book is mainly a bibliography of current reading tests--readiness, achievement, diagnostic, and attitudes. However, there is an interesting section on informal reading inventories and miscue analysis.

(TC#440.1REATEA)

Rea, Dean W. and David K. Thompson. ***Designing Transformative Tests for Secondary Literature Students.*** **Located in: Journal of Reading, 34(1), 1990, pp. 6-11.**

The authors maintain that current tests of reading comprehension do not correspond to current theories concerning how meaning is constructed from text. They propose designing open-ended questions for students that are based on entire reading selections rather than short passages. These open-ended questions represent three levels of comprehension: literal, interpretive and applied. Examples of such questions are provided for three reading selections. Some criteria for evaluating the responses of students is also included. For example, students' responses to a persuasive question could be evaluated for plausibility, relevance, clarity, organization, and detail of the supporting material. Criteria are, however, not defined in detail.

(TC#440.6DESTRF)

Rowell, Glennon. ***An Attitude Scale For Reading.*** **Source unknown.**

This article describes the *Scale of Reading Attitude Based on Behavior*. In this scale another person observes a child in various reading situations and notes their reactions. For example, ratings are done on: "The student exhibits a strong desire to come to the reading circle or to have reading instruction take place, " and "The student asks permission or raises his hand to read orally." Each behavior is rated on a five-point scale from "always occurs" to "never occurs." The sixteen ratings relate to three reading contexts: reading for pleasure, reading in the content areas, and reading in reading class.

The paper presents the entire scale and the results of pilot-testing, which show that ratings between observers can be very consistent. As with all measures of this type, validity is an issue because of the need to identify another way to estimate attitude with which to compare the ratings in the instrument. In this case, the authors chose holistic ratings by the same teachers in the reliability study. Because of these concerns, it is best that the instrument be used informally.

(TC#440.3ATTSCR)

Royer, James. ***The Sentence Verification Technique: A New Direction in the Assessment of Reading Comprehension.*** **Located in: Sue Legg and James Algina (Eds.), Cognitive Assessment of Language and Math Outcomes, 1990, pp. 144-181. Available from: Ablex Publishing Corp., 355 Chestnut St., Norwood, NJ 07648.**

In this paper, the author reviews the theory and research that underlies a new technique for measuring reading comprehension. It includes a good, readable summary of current theories of reading comprehension and how current measures of reading comprehension (multiple-choice tests and cloze techniques) relate to these theories.

The author also considers the similarities between current theories as the underpinning for his *Sentence Verification Technique*, which he calls a measure of reading achievement, as opposed to a measure of reading ability. This procedure entails developing four variations of sentences in a passage:

1. The original sentence
2. A paraphrase of the original sentence that does not change its meaning
3. A change in one or two words in the sentence so that the meaning is changed
4. A sentence with the same syntactic structure as the original sentence, but which is unrelated in meaning to any sentence that appeared in the passage

Students identify which sentences are "old" (types 1 and 2), and "new" (types 3 and 4).

The author also describes a number of studies done on this technique to establish it's validity.

(TC#440.6SENVET)

Schmitt, Maribeth C. ***Metacomprehension Strategies Indexes, A Questionnaire to Measure Children's Awareness of Strategic Reading Processes.*** **Located in: The Reading Teacher, March 1990, pp. 454-461.**

This article describes a 25-item survey/test which asks students about their knowledge of reading strategies.

(TC#440.3METST1)

Shannon, Albert. ***Using the Microcomputer Environment for Reading Diagnosis.*** **Located in: Susan Glazer, Lyndon Searfoss, and Lance Gentile (Eds.), Reexamining Reading Diagnosis: New Trends and Procedures, 1988, pp. 150-168. Available from: International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Rd., P.O. Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714.**

The author maintains that "the reading- and language-related microcomputer environment allows students to engage in four language-generating activities: drill and practice, tutorial, adventure/simulation and problem solving, and composing/writing. Each of these environments provides opportunities to diagnose students' language fluency, composing abilities, expression of self-concept, view of the world, and story sense."

The author describes how microcomputers are currently used for each of the language-generating activities, outlines the types of information that can be obtained from watching students interact with the computer in each area, and presents a checklist to use when observing students using each type of program. Checklist items include things such as confidence when using the program, apparent motivation, ability to predict and control software, metacognitive strategies, ability to understand instructions, and writing features.

(TC#440.3USIMIE)

Sharp, Quality Quinn. *Evaluation: Whole Language Checklists For Evaluating Your Children*, 1989. Available from: Scholastic, Inc., 730 Broadway, New York, NY 10003.

This monograph, designed for grades K-6, has lots of good ideas on things to watch for in reading, writing, and literary appreciation, but few definitions or samples of student responses to help teachers pin down exactly what to look for and how to judge student sophistication. For example, all the following are examples of ratings on checklists or rating forms without definition or samples: "the student enjoys books," the student is "in control," "developing control," or "no evidence of" expansive vocabulary," and the student gives an "elaborate" or "limited" retelling of a story. There is also little help with instruction and no indication of how good is good enough. This monograph would be most useful for knowledgeable teachers looking for ideas.

(TC#400.3EVAWHL)

Stayter, Francine, and Peter Johnston. *Evaluating the Teaching and Learning of Literacy.* Located in: Timothy Shanahan (Ed.), Reading and Writing Together: New Perspectives for the Classroom, 1990. Available from: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc., 480 Washington St., Norwood, MA 02062, 617-762-5577.

This paper is about integrating assessment and instruction -- the use of evaluation as a reflective process in which both teachers and students learn about and develop their skills (teaching or being literate). The entire thrust of the paper is that assessment should be an instructional tool, not one just used for outside monitoring.

The authors argue that teachers construct meaning about their students just as students construct meaning from text. The meanings teachers construct can be different, just as students' constructions of meaning can be different. Each such "reading" has consequences, both in what we learn about students, but also in terms of the messages we send to students. "What we choose to evaluate and how we choose to evaluate delivers powerful messages to students about those things we value." "Students view their learning and their sense of worth through the lens we help them construct unless they cannot bear to look through it." They give some examples of these messages, such as focusing on errors rather than on strengths, and focusing on conventions rather than on meaning. "When writers find that they are being heard, they begin to find their voice." The authors describe some ways to alter these messages by changing how we assess.

They also discuss the power of self-reflection. "Without reflectiveness our students will develop a dependent and powerless literacy." "Students must self-evaluate to be independent in their learning. To do this, teachers cannot project the image that they have all the knowledge and ownership of the correct responses." The authors describe some ways to help the reflective process such as making predictions, conferring with

each other, sharing effective strategies, setting one's own goals, performance criteria, and portfolios.

(TC#150.6EVATEL)

Taylor, Denny. *Teaching Without Testing: Assessing the Complexity of Children's Literacy Learning*. Located in: English Education, 22, 1990, pp. 4-74.

The author describes the *Biographic Literacy Profiles Project*, in its second year when the article was written. The project has endeavored to base understanding of the development of literacy in individual students (i.e., assessing student status and progress) on the careful observation and analysis of daily observable literacy behaviors and products. The article describes what they have learned in the following areas: learning how to observe children's literacy behaviors, learning to develop note-taking procedures to record observations of children reading and writing, learning to write descriptive biographic literacy profiles, and learning to increase awareness of the multiple layers of interpretation that we are incorporating into children's biographic literacy profiles. The process requires a great deal of practice and self-reflection on the part of teachers and principals.

The final part of the article describes reports from teachers and principals on how their approach to instruction is changing based on participation in this project.

(TC#440.3TEAWIT)

Thistlethwaite, Linda L. *Critical Reading For At-Risk Students (Critical Reading Checklists)*. Located in: Journal of Reading, May 1990, pp. 586-593.

This article is primarily about strategies for teaching critical reading skills to at-risk students. (The same procedures could be used for any population.) It is included here because it presents several checklists of criteria for assessing the believability of information. These could also be used for self-reflection or for feedback to peers.

(TC#440.3CRIREA)

Tierney, Robert, Mark Carter, and Laura Desai. *Portfolio Assessment in the Reading-Writing Classroom*, 1991. Available from: Christopher Gordon Publishers, Inc., 480 Washington St., Norwood, MA 02062, 617-762-5577.

This book was designed for classroom teachers, and the information is presented in a very user-friendly style and format. The authors discuss issues surrounding assessment and portfolios, provide many examples of portfolio systems, explore the ways that portfolios can be used instructionally, and show examples of criteria for assessing portfolio entries, portfolios as a whole, and metacognitive letters.

(TC#400.6PORASC)

Valencia, Sheila. *A Portfolio Approach to Classroom Reading Assessment: The Whys, Whats and Hows*. Located in: The Reading Teacher, January 1990, pp. 338-340.

In addition to discussing the rationale for using portfolios to assess reading, this article also suggests content for reading portfolios, how to select material for a portfolio and how the portfolio should be organized.

Portfolio content might include samples of the student's work, the teacher's observational notes, the student's own periodic self-evaluation, and progress notes contributed by the student and teacher collaboratively. Specific items to be included would depend on the purpose for the portfolio but might include such things as written responses to reading, reading logs, selected daily work, classroom tests, checklists, unit projects, etc. The idea is to have a variety of indicators.

The real value of portfolios, according to the author, lies not in any single approach, but rather in the mind set that: 1) sound assessment is anchored in authenticity; 2) assessment must be a continuous process; 3) valid reading assessment must be multi-dimensional; and 4) assessment must provide for active collaborative reflection by both teacher and student.

(TC#440.6APORAP)

Valencia, Sheila, William McGinley, and David Pearson. *Assessing Reading and Writing: Building A More Complete Picture*. Located in: G. Duffey (Ed.), Reading in the Middle School, 1989. Available from: International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Rd., P.O. Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714.

This paper emphasizes the importance of collecting a large number of samples of student performance that represent a wide range of contexts. It describes the dimensions along which tasks differ, so that the teacher can be sure and obtain a good sampling of performance.

(TC#400.3ASSREA)

Valencia, Sheila, David Pearson, Charles Peters, and Karen Wixson. *Theory and Practice in Statewide Reading Assessment: Closing the Gap*. Located in: Educational Leadership, April 1989, pp. 57-63.

The authors report on two state assessments in reading that they feel are more reflective of current research on reading than the assessment approaches of most current standardized achievement tests. They report that the current view of reading suggests that:

- Prior knowledge is an important determinant of reading comprehension.
- Naturally occurring texts have topical and structural integrity.
- Inferential and critical reading are essential for constructing meaning.
- Reading requires the orchestration of many reading skills.
- Skilled readers apply metacognitive strategies to monitor and comprehend a variety of texts for a variety of purposes.
- Positive habits and attitudes affect reading achievement and are important goals of reading instruction.
- Skilled readers are fluent.

The authors feel that current standardized achievement tests do not reflect this body of knowledge while the two state assessments make an attempt to address these issues.

Each has four parts: a primary test component using a full-length selection that measures constructing meaning; a section to assess topic familiarity; questions about metacognition and strategies; and a section on reading attitudes, habits and self-perceptions. A taxonomy of skills/dispositions in these areas is presented. However, the tests are still in structured format: multiple-choice, etc.

(TC#440.6THEANP)

Villano, Jim and Marlys Henderson. *Integrated Language Arts Portfolio*, 1990. Available from: Fairbanks North Star Borough School District, Box 1250, Fairbanks, AK 99707, 907-452-2000.

This draft pilot portfolio system was designed by teachers during the spring of 1990, and was field tested during the 1990-91 school year. It was designed to be a developmentally appropriate assessment of reading, writing, listening, and speaking in grades 1-2. The primary audiences for the portfolio were teachers (to plan instruction), students, and parents (during parent conferences). Depending on the teacher, students select some of the work samples for the portfolio.

The document includes a description of the portfolio and its philosophy, various rating forms and checklists, an evaluation of the system, and a parent review form.

(TC#070.3INTLAA)

Wade, Suzanne E. *Reading Comprehension Using Think Alouds.* Located in: The Reading Teacher, March 1990, pp. 442-451.

This article describes an informal assessment process for assessing comprehension. It covers how to prepare the text, how to administer the think-aloud procedure, and what to look for in student responses.

(TC#440.3REACOA)

White, Jane. *Taxonomy of Reading Behaviors.* Located in: W.T. Fagan, J.M. Jensen, and C.R. Cooper (Eds.), Measures for Research and Evaluation in the English Language Arts Vol. 2, 1985, pp. 120-24. Available from: NCTE, 1111 Kenyon Rd., Urbana IL 61801, 217-328-3870.

The author presents a classification system (originally published in 1980) for analyzing the verbal responses of students after reading a short passage. The classifications include paraphrasing, statements of trouble understanding what was read, statements that indicate what reading strategies the student was using, off-task statements, etc.

(TC#440.3TAXOFR)

Winograd, Peter, Scott Paris, and Connie Bridge. *Improving the Assessment of Literacy.* Located in: The Reading Teacher, 45, 1991, pp. 108-116.

The authors present reasons why multiple-choice tests of comprehension based on short passages do not adequately reflect what we know about reading: they take reading out of its inherent meaning context, test skills in isolation, ignore prior knowledge, and don't look at strategies. Thus, instruction is focused on the wrong targets.

To improve assessment, the authors propose that we need to: clarify the goals of instruction, clarify the purposes of assessment, select multiple measures, and use the results to improve instruction. The authors then apply these steps to reading assessment. They first present three goals in reading: skills that enable students to understand (decoding, interpreting), motivation to be active learners, and independence (selecting and using strategies appropriate for different contexts). Then they discuss the assessment needs of five audiences and discuss multiple measures that could be used to satisfy these needs. For example, students need information so that they can become adept at monitoring their comprehension. Information collection devices could include: audiotapes or oral reading, running records, interviews on progress, and lists of books read.

(TC#440.6IMPASL)

Wixson, Karen K., Anita B. Bosky, Nina Yochum, and Donna E. Alvermann. ***An Interview For Assessing Students' Perceptions of Classroom Reading Tasks.*** **Located in: The Reading Teacher, January 1984, pp. 347-353.**

The Reading Comprehension Interview (RCI) has 15 open-ended questions that explore:

1. The student's perception of the goal/purpose of reading activities.

2. The student's understanding of different reading task requirements.

3. The strategies which the reader reports using when engaging in various reading tasks.

(TC#440.3ANINTF)

Judy Arter, November 1992
NWREL 503.275.9582